

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-27, 29-39, 40, 42-47, 49, 50, 52-56, and 58-61 are pending. An Office Action mailed January 24, 2006 allowed Claims 38, 49, and 58-61, and rejected Claims 1-4, 6-27, 29-37, 40, 42-47, 50, and 52-56. By way of this amendment, Applicant hereby amends Claims 2, 4-13, 16-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-37, 42-47, 52-54, 56, and 59-61, cancels Claims 1, 14, 27, 40, and 50 and adds Claims 62 and 63. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-17, 21, 23, and 25 as being unpatentable over Hennings et al. (hereinafter "Hennings") in view of Tran. With regard to new Claims 62 and 63, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 62 and 63 include the subject matter included in allowable Claims 59-61. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent Claims 62 and 63 are allowable. Because Claims 6-8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 21, 23, and 25 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons as their independent claims.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2-4 and 18-20 as being unpatentable over Hennings and Tran in view of Block et al. Applicant submits that because Claims 2-4 and 18-20 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 9 and 22 as being unpatentable over Hennings and Tran in view of Reynolds. Applicant submits that because Claims 9 and 22 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 11 and 24 as being unpatentable over Hennings and Tran in view of Kelly et al. Applicant submits that because Claims 11 and 24 depend from

allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 13, 26, 29, 30, 34, 36, 42-44, 46, 52, and 53 as being unpatentable over Hennings and Tran in view of Bird et al. Applicant submits that because Claims 13, 26, 27, 29, 30, 34, 36, 42-44, 46, 52, and 53 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 31-33 and 54-56 as being unpatentable over Hennings, Tran, and Bird et al. in view of Block et al. Applicant submits that because Claims 31-33 and 54-56 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 35 and 45 as being unpatentable over Hennings, Tran, and Bird et al. in view of Reynolds. Applicant submits that because Claims 35 and 45 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 37 and 47 as being unpatentable over Hennings, Tran, and Bird et al. in view of Kelley et al. Applicant submits that because Claims 37 and 47 depend from allowable independent claims, it is allowable for the same reasons that make their independent claims allowable.

CONCLUSION

With the amendments set for above, all of the remaining claims stand in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any questions, the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney at the address and telephone numbers set forth above.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



Michael S. Smith

Registration No. 39,563

Direct Dial: 206.381.3300

MAIL CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via first class mail under 37 C.F.R. § 1.08 on the date indicated below addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

3/15/06

Date of Deposit



Michelle J. Carman